

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification has been amended to introduce the phrase --, or shaft,-- to relate the threaded rod 63 to the term "threaded shaft" employed in claim 1.

No new matter is presented and, accordingly, approval and entry of the foregoing specifications amendments are respectfully requested.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

All of the pending claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9-12, 14, 16-21, and 23 are rejected.

ITEM 2: CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 1

The pending claims, as enumerated above, are rejected in item 2 of the Action at page 2, as failing to comply with the "written description requirement" of 35 USC § 112, ¶ 1. Particularly, the action asserts:

The limitations "...a length of a part of each fastening shaft projecting from the front surface of the connector unit, in a state in which the connector unit is not attached to the electronic apparatus, being shorter than a length of a part of the second connector projecting from the front surface of the connector unit" are not describe [sic. - described] in the specification.

(Emphasis in original; insert added)

It is understood that the § 112, ¶ 1 rejection relates to the clause which is emphasized in the foregoing block quote.

The rejection is respectfully traversed.

In accordance with a brief telephone interview with Examiner Le on August 4, 2004, it was understood that the basis on which the Examiner raises the § 112, ¶ 1 rejection is that the claim recites a "threaded shaft" whereas the specification recites a "threaded rod"; accordingly, the foregoing specification amendment was discussed, which establishes the equivalence of "rod" and "shaft" and, further, is sufficient to overcome the § 112, ¶ 1 rejection. (It is noted that the Examiner was very busy and did not have time to obtain the file to have a more detailed discussion.)

In further consideration of claim 1, it was recognized that the term "fastening shaft" was intended to have antecedent support in the recitation two lines earlier in the claim of "a threaded shaft." Accordingly, claim 1 has been amended to establish proper antecedent basis for that term.

In further explanation of the claim limitation on which the § 112, ¶ 1 rejection is based, and by way of background, Figs. 2A and 2B illustrate the detachable connector box 53 and the electronic apparatus 1 to which the connector box 53 is to be mounted. (See page 6, lines 5-12)

With further reference to Figs. 3A-3C and page 6, line 17 - page 8, line 24, the common connector 51 on the rear surface of the housing 5 of the personal computer 1 (i.e., "electronic apparatus") is adapted to be detachably connected to the connector 55 of the connector box 53 (see element 55 in Fig. 2A, 3B and 3C). The connector box 53 further has "a pair of guide pins 57 on both sides thereof for facilitating the connector engagement...and are engageable with corresponding guide holes (not shown) provided at corresponding positions in the lower housing (5) and also functions as grounding connectors." (Page 6, lines 17-23)

With reference to the plan view of Fig. 3B, the guide pins 57 of the connector section 55 extend outwardly from the front surface of the connector box 53, as do respective parts of the threaded shafts 63, the projecting portions of the threaded shafts 63:

...in a state in which the connector unit is not attached to the electronic apparatus, being shorter than a length of a part of the second connector projecting from the front surface of the connector unit.

(Closing clause of claim 1, the subject of the § 112, ¶ 1 rejection). Fig. 3B, of course, illustrates the connector box/unit 53 in the state recited in claim 1, quoted above, in which the same is not attached to the electronic apparatus/computer 1.

The condition of "a state in which the connector unit is not attached to the electronic apparatus", of the disputed recitation, corresponds to the "not attached" relationship of those components shown in Figs. 2A, 2B and 3A-3C; the arrows in Figs. 2A and 2B, on the other hand, indicate the intended assemblage of the connector box 53 with the base 5 of the computer 1.

It should also be noted that the threaded shafts 63 are biased to the outwardly extended state shown in Fig. 3B by respective coil springs 73 such that when the box 53 and housing 5 are brought into surface-contact with each other, the threaded rods/shafts 63 are pushed into the main body 65 against the biasing force of the compressor coil spring 67 in the main body 65

of the fastener 61, while being "fittingly in contact with female thread section 77..." thereby maintaining a state in which the threaded rods or shafts 63 are "easily engageable with female thread section(s) 77...." (Page 7, lines 23-30) The convenience of this detachable connector unit is further explained at page 7, line 31 through page 8, line 24.

The claims in the foregoing additionally recite the guide pins which afford a reference length relative to the threaded shaft/fastening shaft elements which, in their retracted positions, project outwardly by a length which is less than that of the guide pins.

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the specification and drawings fully comply with the "written description requirement" of 35 USC § 112, ¶ 1 and thus that the rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

There being no other objections or rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

Mar 18, 2004

By:


H. J. Staas
Registration No. 22,010

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501